

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/644,426	08/20/2003	Ernest Oxenknecht	60680-1638	7013	
10291	7590 02/02/2005		EXAMINER		
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC			SICONOLF	SICONOLFI, ROBERT	
SUITE 140	OWARD AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BLOOMFIEL	D HILLS, MI 48304-0	0610	3683		
		•	DATE MAILED: 02/02/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<i>\</i> }				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	•/				
Advisory Action	10/644,426	OXENKNECHT ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Robert A. Siconolfi	3683					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 18 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applican must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. 							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHII TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extends to the fee. The appropriate extends the final Office act	xtension fee tion: or (2) a				
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeting was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4. Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 Chas been filed, any reply must be filed within the time per AMENDMENTS	1.37 must be filed within two month FR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of	s of the date of filing the N	otice of				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	TE below);					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8,11 and 14-23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	will not be entered, or b) will will will will will will will w	l be entered and an explar	nation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An evolunation 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fails to pee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	ot be provide a				
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 							
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
13. Other: For purposes of appeal, claims 14,15, and 18 would be rejected under 35 USC 103 as in paragraph 6 of the final							
rejection. Amended claim 14 pulls in limitations from claim 16 w	hich was rejected in said paragrap	Robert A. Siconoffi Examiner Art Unit: 3683	<u>=</u> 1 8//08				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 9-04) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants have tried to refute examiner's motivation to combine. Examiner has not been persuaded. With regard to fastnening from both sides, applicant refuses to figure 2 of Stephenson. However, Stephenson suffers from the same deficiency and the examiner is unclear how an embodiment using two fastener is suppose to teach the use of a single fastener. With regard to misalignment, Applicant argues mainly with regard to figure 2 of Stephenson. Since this is not the basis of rejection, those arguments are irrelevant. Furthermore, Applicant makes the statement that it is easier to align in a two step process. The examiner disagrees. Once bolt 30 is tightened down, the align of the hole for bolt 31 and the tubular body is fixed. Therefore, if the alignment is not correct, the assembler must loosen bolt 30 to enable some movement and allow alignment. After bolt 31 was tightened, then bolt 30 would need to be retightened. With regard to the mount falling apart, the applicant admits that at least part of the mount of Stephenson would fall apart. Therefore, the examiner does not understand this line of reasoning.